



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,088	10/11/2005	Sadaka Suzuki	SONY JP 3.3-314	7329
530 7590 09/16/2009 LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090				
EXAMINER YADAV, HIMANSHU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2193				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/16/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,088

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

HIMANSHU YADAV

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2007 and 10 December 2007.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/23/2004, 3/26/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to amendments dated November 8, 2007 and December 10, 2007.
2. Per Applicants' request, the Specification, the Abstract, and claims 1-11 have been amended, and claims 12-25 have been added.
3. Claims 1-25 remain pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed 12/23/2004 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the reference "JP-2001-319267-A" is a foreign reference with no corresponding English translation. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
The term "factor" on page 2, line 2, should be replaced with the term --factory--.
6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17, 18, 19-21, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (US Pub. No: 2001/0044675 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Matsumoto et al. discloses an information processing apparatus, comprising (Abstract): a plurality of control units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]); and a plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; paragraph [0033]); said plurality of control units including: a main control unit operable to control another of said plurality of control units to cause software read from a recording medium to be stored in a particular one of said plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; figure 7; paragraph [0065]), said particular one of said plurality of storage units being selected by said main control unit (figure 7; paragraph [0063]; paragraph [0065]; *the terminal apparatus is chosen by the main control unit according to the data in the new control program stored in the memory card*), said another of said plurality of control units being associated with a portion of said plurality of storage units that includes said selected one of said plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; *each terminal apparatus has a storage unit and a control unit that is associated with that storage unit*); said another of said plurality of control units including: first acquisition means for acquiring from said main control unit an instruction that indicates which one of said portion of

said plurality of storage units is said selected one of said plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*); request means for requesting the software from said main control unit (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0051]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus sends a message to the main apparatus when it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); second acquisition means for acquiring the requested software (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus receives the rewriting program from the main apparatus after it sends the message that it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); and storage control means for storing the acquired software in said selected one of said plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *putting a rewriting program into only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*).

Regarding claim 2, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Matsumoto et al. further discloses the instruction includes information associated with the software and information associated with said selected one of said plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0051]: *it is judged whether the rewriting start command is of a type different than the type of the terminal control apparatus, so the rewriting start command includes the information associated with the software and information associated with the terminal apparatus*; paragraph

[0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM).*

Regarding claim 3, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 2. Matsumoto et al. further discloses storage unit setting means for selecting, from said portion of said plurality of storage units, said selected one of said plurality of storage units, and for setting said selected one of said plurality of storage units to store the software acquired by said second acquisition means (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM, and it is stored in there after being received).*

Regarding claim 4, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Matsumoto et al. further discloses confirmation means for providing confirmation as to whether said storing of the software in said selected one of said plurality of storage units was completed normally (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]; paragraph [0053]); and supply means for supplying the confirmation to said main control unit (figure 5; paragraph [0052]; paragraph [0053]).

Regarding claim 7, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Matsumoto et al. further discloses the storage medium in which said software is stored is a removable memory card (figure 2; paragraph [0028]), and said main control unit updates a stored program or stored

data in said selected one of said plurality of storage units with the program or with data acquired from said memory card (Abstract; figure 7; paragraph [0063]; paragraph [0066]; paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim 8, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Matsumoto et al. further discloses the storage control means compares first version information of the software acquired by said second acquisition means with second version information of stored software in said selected one of said storage units and, if the first version information and the second version information do not match, said storage control means updates the stored software with the software acquired by said second acquisition means (figure 8; paragraph [0072]; paragraph [0074]; paragraph [0075]).

Regarding claim 9, Matsumoto et al. discloses in an information processing apparatus having (Abstract) a plurality of control units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]) and a plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; paragraph [0033]), the plurality of control units including a main control unit operable to control another of the plurality of control units to cause software read from a recording medium to be stored in a particular one of the plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; figure 7; paragraph [0065]), the particular one of the plurality of storage units being selected by the main control unit (figure 7; paragraph [0063]; paragraph [0065]; *the terminal apparatus is chosen by the main control unit according to the data in the new control program stored in the memory card*), the another of the plurality of control units being associated

with a portion of the plurality of storage units that includes the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]: *each terminal apparatus has a storage unit and a control unit that is associated with that storage unit*), an information processing method comprising (Abstract): acquiring, by the another of the plurality of control units from the main control unit, an instruction that indicates which one of the portion of the plurality of storage units is the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*); requesting, by the another of the plurality of control units, the software from the main control unit (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0051]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus sends a message to the main apparatus when it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); acquiring, by the another of the plurality of control units, the requested software (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus receives the rewriting program from the main apparatus after it sends the message that it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); and storing, by the another of the plurality of control units, the acquired software in the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *putting a rewriting program into only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*).

Regarding claim 10, Matsumoto et al. discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable program for carrying out an information processing method (Abstract;

figure 3; paragraph [0038]) in an information processing apparatus (Abstract) having a plurality of control units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]) and a plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; paragraph [0033]), the plurality of control units including a main control unit operable to control another of the plurality of control units to cause software read from a recording medium to be stored in a particular one of the plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; figure 7; paragraph [0065]), the particular one of the plurality of storage units being selected by the main control unit (figure 7; paragraph [0063]; paragraph [0065]: *the terminal apparatus is chosen by the main control unit according to the data in the new control program stored in the memory card*), the another of the plurality of control units being associated with a portion of the plurality of storage units that includes the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]: *each terminal apparatus has a storage unit and a control unit that is associated with that storage unit*), said information processing method comprising: acquiring, by the another of the plurality of control units from the main control unit, an instruction that indicates which one of the portion of the plurality of storage units is the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*); requesting, by the another of the plurality of control units, the software from the main control unit (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0051]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus sends a message to the main apparatus when it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); acquiring, by the another of the

plurality of control units, the requested software (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus receives the rewriting program from the main apparatus after it sends the message that it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); and storing, by the another of the plurality of control units, the acquired software in the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *putting a rewriting program into only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*).

Regarding claim 11, Matsumoto et al. discloses a processor having a program for carrying out an information processing method (Abstract; figure 3; paragraph [0038]) an information processing apparatus (Abstract) having a plurality of control units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]) and a plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; paragraph [0033]), the plurality of control units including a main control unit operable to control another of the plurality of control units to cause software read from a recording medium to be stored in a particular one of the plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]; figure 7; paragraph [0065]), the particular one of the plurality of storage units being selected by the main control unit (figure 7; paragraph [0063]; paragraph [0065]: *the terminal apparatus is chosen by the main control unit according to the data in the new control program stored in the memory card*), the another of the plurality of control units being associated with a portion of the plurality of storage units that includes the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 1; paragraph [0025]; figure 2; paragraph [0028]: *each terminal apparatus has a storage unit and a control unit that is*

associated with that storage unit), said information processing method comprising: acquiring, by the another of the plurality of control units from the main control unit, an instruction that indicates which one of the portion of the plurality of storage units is the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*); requesting, by the another of the plurality of control units, the software from the main control unit (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0051]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus sends a message to the main apparatus when it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); acquiring, by the another of the plurality of control units, the requested software (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the terminal apparatus receives the rewriting program from the main apparatus after it sends the message that it is ready to receive the rewriting program*); and storing, by the another of the plurality of control units, the acquired software in the selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *putting a rewriting program into only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*).

Regarding claim 12, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 9. Matsumoto et al. further discloses the instruction includes information associated with the software and information associated with said selected one of the plurality of storage units (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph

[0051]: *it is judged whether the rewriting start command is of a type different than the type of the terminal control apparatus, so the rewriting start command includes the information associated with the software and information associated with the terminal apparatus*; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM*).

Regarding claim 13, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 12. Matsumoto et al. further discloses selecting, by the another of the plurality of control units from the portion of the plurality of storage units, the selected one of the plurality of storage units, and setting, by the another of the plurality of control units, the selected one of the plurality of storage units to store the acquired software (figure 3; paragraph [0039]: *the terminal apparatus has multiple storage units*; figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]: *the rewriting start command is sent to the terminal apparatus, and the rewriting program is for only one of the multiple storage units that the terminal apparatus has, the RAM, and it is stored in there after being received*).

Regarding claim 14, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 9. Matsumoto et al. further discloses providing confirmation, by the another of the plurality of control units, as to whether said step of storing the acquired software in the selected one of the plurality of storage units was completed normally (figure 5; paragraph [0050]; paragraph [0052]; paragraph [0053]), and supplying the confirmation to the main control unit (figure 5; paragraph [0052]; paragraph [0053]).

Regarding claim 17, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 9. Matsumoto et al. further discloses the storage medium in which the software is stored is a removable memory card (figure 2; paragraph [0028]), and said information processing method updates a stored program or stored data in the selected one of the plurality of storage units with the program or with data acquired from the memory card (Abstract; figure 7; paragraph [0063]; paragraph [0066]; paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim 18, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 9. Matsumoto et al. further discloses comparing, by the another of the plurality of control units, first version information of the acquired software with second version information of stored software in the selected one of the storage units, and updating, by the another of the plurality of control units if the first version information and the second version information do not match, the stored software with the acquired software (figure 8; paragraph [0072]; paragraph [0074]; paragraph [0075]).

Regarding claims 19-21, 24 and 25, the claims are directed to the computer-readable medium which corresponds to the method claims 12-14, 17 and 18 respectively above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2193

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(e) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (US Pub. No: 2001/0044675 A1) in view of Namikawa (EP 0 844 556 A2).

Regarding claim 5, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 4. Matsumoto et al. further discloses if the supplied confirmation indicates that said storing of the software in said selected one of said plurality of storage units was completed normally said main control unit *receives a message that is the indication of the normal completion and emits this message*

through a speaker (figure 3; paragraph [0038]: *the main control apparatus has a piezoelectric speaker*; figure 7; paragraph [0069]); *the main control apparatus has a display section* (figure 2; paragraph [0028]). It is noted that Matsumoto et al. does not explicitly disclose causes a display unit to display information indicative of the normal completion.

However, Namikawa discloses *causing a display unit to display information indicative of the successful transfer of data* (figure 3; column 9, lines 45-55); *an information processing apparatus with a host device and other external devices, where the host device replaces the control program of each external device with a new control program* (Abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious and well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matsumoto et al. with Namikawa, so that when the main control apparatus receives a message that the program successfully transferred to the terminal control apparatus it can display a message as well as emitting noise to indicate the success. The motivation for this modification is so that if for some reason the noise is not heard then by also having displaying a message, the user will know of the success upon looking at the display.

Regarding claim 6, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 4. Matsumoto et al. further discloses if the supplied confirmation indicates that said storing of the software in said selected one of said plurality of storage units was not completed normally, said main control unit *receives a message that is the indication of the not normal completion and emits this message through a speaker* (figure 3; paragraph [0038]: *the main control apparatus has a piezoelectric speaker*; figure 7; paragraph [0070]); *the main control apparatus has a display section* (figure 2;

paragraph [0028]). It is noted that Matsumoto et al. does not explicitly disclose causes a display unit to display information indicating that an error has occurred.

However, Namikawa discloses *causing a display unit to display information indicative of the not successful transfer of data* (figure 3; column 9, lines 45-55); *an information processing apparatus with a host device and other external devices, where the host device replaces the control program of each external device with a new control program* (Abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious and well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matsumoto et al. with Namikawa, so that when the main control apparatus receives a message that the program was not successfully transferred to the terminal control apparatus it can display a message as well as emitting noise to indicate the failure. The motivation for this modification is so that if for some reason the noise is not heard then by also having displaying a message, the user will know of the failure upon looking at the display.

Regarding claim 15, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 14. Matsumoto et al. further discloses if the supplied confirmation indicates that said step of storing the software in the selected one of the plurality of storage units was completed normally, the main control unit *receives a message that is the indication of the normal completion and emits this message through a speaker* (figure 3; paragraph [0038]: *the main control apparatus has a piezoelectric speaker*; figure 7; paragraph [0069]); *the main control apparatus has a display section* (figure 2; paragraph [0028]). It is noted that Matsumoto et al. does not explicitly disclose causes display of information indicative of the normal completion.

However, Namikawa discloses *causing a display unit to display information indicative of the successful transfer of data* (figure 3; column 9, lines 45-55); *an information processing apparatus with a host device and other external devices, where the host device replaces the control program of each external device with a new control program* (Abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious and well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matsumoto et al. with Namikawa, so that when the main control apparatus receives a message that the program successfully transferred to the terminal control apparatus it can display a message as well as emitting noise to indicate the success. The motivation for this modification is so that if for some reason the noise is not heard then by also having displaying a message, the user will know of the success upon looking at the display.

Regarding claim 16, Matsumoto et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 14. Matsumoto et al. further discloses if the supplied confirmation indicates that said step of storing the software in the selected one of the plurality of storage units was not completed normally, the main control unit *receives a message that is the indication of the not normal completion and emits this message through a speaker* (figure 3; paragraph [0038]: *the main control apparatus has a piezoelectric speaker*; figure 7; paragraph [0070]); *the main control apparatus has a display section* (figure 2; paragraph [0028]). It is noted that Matsumoto et al. does not explicitly disclose causes display of information indicating that an error has occurred.

However, Namikawa discloses *causing a display unit to display information indicative of the not successful transfer of data* (figure 3; column 9, lines 45-55); *an information processing*

apparatus with a host device and other external devices, where the host device replaces the control program of each external device with a new control program (Abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious and well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matsumoto et al. with Namikawa, so that when the main control apparatus receives a message that the program was not successfully transferred to the terminal control apparatus it can display a message as well as emitting noise to indicate the failure. The motivation for this modification is so that if for some reason the noise is not heard then by also having displaying a message, the user will know of the failure upon looking at the display.

Regarding claims 22 and 23, the claims are directed to the computer-readable medium which corresponds to the method claims 15 and 16 respectively above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HIMANSHU YADAV whose telephone number is (571)270-7829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., alternate Fridays, est..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H.Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2193
9/10/2009

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193